DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 657 UD 018 907

TITLE National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity, Calendar Year 1977 Report.
INSTITUTION National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity.
PUB DATE 31 Mar 78
NOTE 42p.; For a related document, see ED 145 062

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Annual Reports; Educational Legislation; *Educational Opportunities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; *Federal Programs; Minority Groups; *Program Evaluation; School Integration
IDENTIFIERS *Emergency School Aid Act

ABSTRACT

The authority, function, activities and major recommendations of the National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity (NACEEO) are described in this report. Recommendations adopted by the Evaluation Task Force were: (1) that studies be undertaken to provide more information about the processes involved in increasing achievement levels, about differential teaching actions between the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) and non-ESAA schools, and about the effects on achievement levels of grade repetition for students in elementary schools; and (2) that steps be taken to create satisfactory measuring devices of the school climate. A list of council members, all of whom are private citizens, and their addresses is included. Three appendices contain the following reports: (1) the August 1977 Report of the Task Force on Evaluation of the NACEEO, which discusses and criticizes "The Third Year of Emergency School Aid Act Implementation" (Coulson, et al, 1977), and "An In-Depth Study of the Emergency School Aid Act: (Wellisch, et al, 1977), which present cross-sectional results of the national evaluation of Basic Elementary, Pilot Elementary, and Basic Secondary programs during ESAA's third year; (2) the May 1978 Final Report of the Task Force on Evaluation of the NACEEO, which makes recommendations about educational assessments of achievement of minority group students; and (3) the Report of the Legislative and Administrative Task Force of the NACEEO which makes policy, administrative, and various practical suggestions about ESAA programs. (WI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

NOV 3 0 1978

ED164657

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON
EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Calendar Year 1977 Report

March 31, 1978

UD018907

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	3
Authority/Function	5
1977 Council Organization	7
List of Council Members and Business Addresses	8
Dates and Places of Meetings	9
Major Activities	10
Recommendations Adopted	11
Appendix	13
A) Evaluation Report, 1977	15
B1) Evaluation Report, 1978	25
B2) Legislative & Administrative Report, 1978	39

INTRODUCTION

The National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity was established June 1972. Since that time, it has fulfilled its obligations as mandated by law, submitting regular annual reports over the five years.

NACEEO has been under the threat of termination every year since its creation. This condition has caused NACEEO many problems, among them being long-range planning and scheduling of project execution sequences.

Congressional action in 1976, which finally extended NACEEO beyond a one year period, was taken as a turning point in recognizing the benefit of having a national citizens council to advise on the crucial issue of school desegregation assistance. Regrettably, the action by USOE in early 1978 to merge this Council with ESEA Title I, and the present language in the House bill H.R. 15 deleting NACEEO from the Emergency School Aid Act testifies to the persistent negative approach toward nonpartisan citizens advisory oversight on federal funds dealing with school desegregation.

If the Council is allowed to exist beyond September, 1978, we will issue an interim report containing information and recommendations based on projects which will be completed by October 1, 1978.

Gwen R. Awsumb

GWEN R. AWSUMB
Chairman

AUTHORITY/FUNCTION

The Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA)* was enacted to provide financial assistance for relieving problems associated with public school desegregation and/or the reduction of minority group isolation. The specific functions of ESAA are to provide financial assistance:

"(1) to meet the special needs incident to the elimination of minority group segregation and discrimination among students and faculty in elementary and secondary schools;

"(2) to encourage the voluntary elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority group isolation in elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority group students; and

"(3) to aid school children in overcoming the educational disadvantages of minority group isolation."

Section 716 of the Act mandated the establishment of a 15-member National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity (NACEEO), with at least half of the members representing minority groups. The Council has four specific purposes:

"(1) advise the Assistant Secretary with respect to the operation of the program authorized by this title, including the preparation of regulations and development of criteria for the approval of applications;

*The Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) was passed in June, 1972 (Public Law 92-318, Title VII) as a successor to the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP) of 1970. The Education Amendments of 1974 (Public Law 93-380, Title VI, Section D) authorized continuance of ESAA through June 20, 1976, and Public Law 94-482, Title III, Section 321, authorized continuance of ESAA through September 30, 1979.

"(2) review the operation of the program (A) with respect to its effectiveness in achieving its purpose as stated in section 702(b), and (B) with respect to the Assistant Secretary's conduct in the administration of the program;

"(3) meet not less than four times in the period during which the program is authorized, and submit, through the Secretary, to the Congress at least two interim reports, which reports shall include a statement of its activities and of any recommendations it may have with respect to the operation of the program; and

"(4) submit to the Congress a final report on the operation of the program."

1977 COUNCIL ORGANIZATION

Chairman -- Gwen R. Awsumb

Executive Task Force:

Chairman -- Gwen R. Awsumb
Vice-Chairman -- Loftus C. Carson

Evaluation Task Force:

Chairman -- Jacquelyne J. Jackson
Haruko Morita
Frederick Mosteller

Legislative & Administrative Task Force:

Chairman -- Edward P. Meyers
Lawrence F. Davenport
Jackson F. Lee
Sally A. Stempinski

Nonmajority/Minority Task Force:

Chairman -- Carmen A. Rodriguez
Thomas A. Aranda, Jr.
Loftus C. Carson
Haruko Morita
Lyman F. Pierce

Reports and Communications Task Force:

Chairman -- T. Winston Cole, Sr.
June G. Cameron
Alfred L. McElroy

Staff:

Executive Director -- Leo A. Lorenzo
Administrative Assistant -- Rosemarie Maynez
Secretary -- Deborah Linderman

LIST OF COUNCIL MEMBERS AND BUSINESS ADDRESSES

Gwen R. Awsumb
Director of Community Development
City of Memphis
125 N. Main Street
Memphis, Tennessee 38103

Thomas Aranda, Jr.
Attorney At Law
3443 North Central, Suite 419
Phoenix, Arizona 85012

June G. Cameron
Member, Board of Education
Mt. Lebanon School District
812 White Oak Circle
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15228

Loftus C. Carson
Executive Director
Monroe County Human Relations Commission
80 Main Street, West
Rochester, New York 14614

T. Winston Cole, Sr., Ed.D.
Dean of Academic Affairs for Instructional Services and University Ombudsman
University of Florida
Room 231, Tigert Hall
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Lawrence F. Davenport, Ed.D.
President, Educational Cultural Complex
San Diego Community College District
4343 Ocean View Boulevard
San Diego, California 92113

Jacquelyne J. Jackson, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Medical Sociology
Duke University Medical Center
P. O. Box 3003
Durham, North Carolina 27710

Jackson F. Lee
Vice President
Murchison and Bailey, Inc.
P. O. Box 816
Fayetteville, North Carolina 28302

Alfred McElroy
Division Manager
National Western Life Ins. Co.
P. O. Box 1294
Port Arthur, Texas 77640

Edward P. Meyers, J.D.
Associate, Public Finance
The First Boston Corporation
20 Exchange Place
New York, New York 10005

Haruko Morita, Ed.D.
Principal, Hillside School
120 East Avenue 35
Los Angeles, California 90031

Frederick Mosteller, Ph.D.
Professor and Chairman of the Department of Biostatistics
Harvard School of Public Health
677 Huntington Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

Lyman F. Pierce
Executive Director
American Indian Manpower Program
1124 West Granville
Chicago, Illinois 60660

Carmen A. Rodriguez
Community Superintendent
District 7, City School District of New York
501 Courtland Avenue
Bronx, New York 10451

Sally Stempinski, Ed.S.
Teacher
Conley Hills Elementary School
2580 DeLowe Drive
East Point, Georgia 30344

DATES AND PLACES OF MEETINGS

January 28-29	Full Council	Orlando, Florida
March 26	Nonmajority/Minority Task Force	Alexandria, Virginia
May 28-29	Evaluation Task Force	Durham, North Carolina
June 3-4	Full Council	Boston, Massachusetts
June 10	Nonmajority/Minority Task Force	New York, New York
August 22-23	Evaluation Task Force	Arlington, Virginia
August 26	Nonmajority/Minority Task Force	Los Angeles, California
September 23-24	Full Council	Albuquerque, New Mexico

MAJOR ACTIVITIES

The major activities consummated during the 1977 calendar year by NACEEO are as follows:

1) Produced a calendar year report for 1976.
2) Presented testimony to the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, for its oversight hearings on national advisory councils.
3) Reviewed ESAA program administration by the ten USOE regional offices.
4) Developed NACEEO position paper on magnet schools and other changes in the federal regulations proposed by the U.S. Office of Education.
5) Conducted two public hearings dealing with the concerns of the monmajority/minorities affected by ESAA programs throughout the country.
6) Held three full Council meetings (Florida, Massachusetts, New Mexico).
7) Held three Subcommittee meetings.
8) Twenty-five site visitations were made by members to ESAA projects.
9) Members participated in several conferences and workshops dealing with desegregation issues.

RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED

The following recommendations by the Evaluation Task Force were adopted by the full Council and forwarded to the Assistant Secretary for her consideration and action:[1]

1) That studies be undertaken to provide more information about the processes involved in increasing achievement levels, about differential teaching actions between the ESAA and nonESAA schools, and about the effects on achievement levels of grade repetition for students in elementary schools.

2) There is a lack of satisfactory measuring devices of school climate, which are important to the nation's educational program. We request that steps be taken to ensure that this affective domain can be evaluated.

The Council is presently in the process of developing additional recommendations which shall be submitted to the Office of Education in our fourth interim report scheduled for release in January 1979.[2]

---

[1]Refer to Appendix A.

[2]Refer to Appendixes B1 and B2.

APPENDIX

A) Evaluation Report, 1977

B1) Evaluation Report, 1978

B2) Legislative & Administrative Report, 1978

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON EVALUATION

of the

National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity

22 - 23 August 1977

Prepared for presentation

to the

FULL COUNCIL

of the

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

as an action item

on

24 September 1977

Albuquerque, New Mexico

****

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task Force on Evaluation recommends that NACEEO:

(1) suggest to the Assistant Secretary of Education that studies be undertaken to provide more information about the processes involved in increasing achievement levels, about differential teaching actions between the ESAA and the non-ESAA schools, and about the effects on achievement levels of grade repetition for students in elementary schools; and

(2) inform the Assistant Secretary of Education of the lack of satisfactory measuring devices of school climate and of their importance to the nation's educational program, and request that steps be taken to ensure that this affective domain can be evaluated.

****

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON EVALUATION

of the

National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity

22 - 23 August 1977

The Task Force on Evaluation of the National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity (NACEEO) reviewed in detail (1) The Third Year of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Implementation (Coulson, et al., 1977), and (2) An In-Depth Study of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Schools: 1975-1976 (Wellisch, et al., 1977). These two works present the crosssectional results of the national evaluation of the Basic Elementary, Pilot Elementary, and Basic Secondary programs during the third operational year of ESAA; longitudinal results about the achievement of students in the national sample between the years 1973-74 and 1975-76; and results from the in-depth study of 26 elementary schools in 1975-1976.

This report to NACEEO from its Task Force on Evaluation deals primarily with:

1) summaries of the major findings of these two works, including their recommendations; and

2) our discussion of and recommendations related to those summaries.

We are particularly concerned about the implications of the study findings for educational programs and educational research.

SUMMARY

For technical reasons, the Basic Elementary sample was the only group yielding firm data on changes in achievement. In the third year of the ESAA pro-

gram, but not the first two years, the Basic Elementary sample showed improvement in achievement in both Reading and Mathematics, favoring the ESAA-funded (or treatment) schools over the non-funded (or control) schools. In this sample, the treatment schools had substantially higher per-pupil expenditures than did their control schools. The average increase in expenditures for treatment schools was about $400, or an increase of about one-third over the approximately $1,200 spent per pupil by the control schools. The treatment schools spent significantly more monies on reading and mathematics instruction and on intergroup and cultural enrichment activities than did the control schools.

Data for the third year of ESAA indicated that the majority of ESAA funds were allocated to the Basic and Pilot programs. These funds were generally funneled to the more educationally needy school districts and, in turn, to the more needy schools and students within those districts. Need was determined by student pretest scores on standardized reading and mathematics achievement tests. The percentile ranks of student recipients of ESAA funds were usually in the bottom third. Most of these recipients also belonged to lower socioeconomic families as measured by parental education and occupation and by a scale of luxury items in the home. Most of the ESAA funds were spent on basic instruction.

Perhaps due to differential stages of desegregation between the basic secondary and elementary schools, a positive relationship emerged between student achievement and activities promoting a favorable interracial climate in the secondary schools, while a negative relationship between these two variables was found for the elementary schools.

In testing disadvantaged pupils, concern arises that the test may not fairly reflect the pupils' progress. To minimize such a possibility, the System Development Corporation (SDC) carefully restandardized the test norms and analyzed the data on both the new scale and the original scale. The new analysis left the patterns of test scores and differences practically identical with that given by the original analysis. Thus, the original standardization and the restandardization left the interpretations unchanged. In Year Two, the SDC report had also found that the interpretations were the same under both scalings.

The in-depth analysis of 26 elementary schools selected from the top and bottom of the reading and mathematical rankings of 78 schools identified several variables which substantially affected student achievement. The major findings of this study are set forth below, as reported specifically by the Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation of the U. S. Office of Education (1977:5-6):

> Organizational Climate. The more successful schools had administrators who (a) felt strongly about instruction and communicated these views to teachers (through regular review and discussions with teachers), (b) assumed greater responsibility for selecting instructional materials and for planning and evaluating school programs, and (c) emphasized academic standards by reviewing teaching performance, by opposing postponement of basic skills instruction, and by requiring low-achieving students to repeat grades.
>
> Instructional Practices in Reading and Mathematics. Students were significantly more likely to gain in Mathematics when teachers (a) introduced a lesson by placing it in the context of previously-learned material, (b) praised students frequently and favored restricting rewards to desired behaviors, (c)

used behavioral objectives and placed importance on setting challenging goals, and (d) emphasized behavioral objectives and individualized instruction. A similar trend was observed for achievement gains in Reading.

Equality of Educational Opportunity. In schools placing greater emphasis on equality of educational opportunity, students were significantly more likely to interact without regard to race or ethnicity, minority-group students were significantly more likely to perceive teachers as treating them favorably, and schools that placed greater emphasis on providing equality of educational opportunity were more successful in raising student achievement.

The Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation of the U. S. Office of Education (1977:6) summarized the ESAA evaluation thusly:

> A three-year evaluation of the ESAA Basic and Pilot Project Grants programs indicates that, by the end of the third year, the program appears to be having some impact on student achievement. This impact was limited to the Basic Elementary sample. Conclusions could not be drawn about ESAA impact in the Basic Secondary and Pilot Elementary samples because similarities in patterns of expenditures between treatment and control schools indicated that for these two samples ESAA and non-ESAA students were receiving the same kind of education. Regarding program attributes /observed to be/ most effective, student achievement was higher in those programs where (a) there was strong administrative leadership behind the ESAA program, (b) instructional practices relied heavily on the use of behavioral objectives and individualized instruction, and (c) emphasis was placed on equality of educational opportunity. The program does not yet appear to be having any effect on student perception of school climate.

Overall, the results of the ESAA evaluation suggested that substantial per-pupil expenditures in needy schools for relevant instructional and related activities may foster improved cognitive achievement levels of needy students.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Essentially, two kinds of data are being reported on in the various analyses referred to above. One is the experimental results of ESAA itself. The second is not directly related to ESAA, but is concerned with better ways of teaching minority and disadvantaged students without regard to the funding source.

An apparent trend in the Year III report is a reemphasis on traditional values and behavioral modalities, including especially the classic roles of principals and teachers. Greater direct involvement of principals and teachers in the instructional processes, and greater emphasis on basic instruction seem to be related to success in teaching. Traditional instruction is observed to be associated with greater gains in academic achievement.

Spending money directly upon basic instruction to reach the objective of improving reading and mathematical achievement levels may be good. The ESAA evaluation studies provide little detailed information on the processes involved in increasing achievement levels.

Further analyses of existing data collected by SDC in the evaluation studies may provide some additional information about process. The Year III report suggested that program funding and program maturation were probably causal variables affecting achievement levels of ESAA students. About two-thirds of supplemental funds from all sources in the ESAA schools were spent on instruction in reading and mathematics.

The majority of these funds were expended on reading. We need to know what teaching actions these expenditures led to and how these differed from what was done in the non-ESAA schools.

The in-depth analysis of the successful and nonsuccessful elementary schools showed that the former were substantially more likely to have students repeat grades to meet academic standards. Administrators of the successful schools were also much more likely to stress traditional education. These results suggest the need for more information about relationships between achievement levels and grade repetition for students who normally would receive social promotions.

Therefore, the Task Force on Evaluation recommends that NACEEO suggest to the Assistant Secretary of Education that studies be undertaken to provide more information about the processes involved in increasing achievement levels, about differential teaching actions between the ESAA and the non-ESAA schools, and about the effects on achievement levels of grade repetition for students in elementary schools.

Measuring school climate to appraise the relation between children's perceptions of the educational atmosphere and their achievement seems a natural task in a large-scale educational study. In the Year III report, the authors concluded that the psychometric properties of their school climate scales were inadequate. The Task Force on Evaluation regards the measurement of school climate as important in studies of how to improve academic achievement. Therefore, it wishes

to encourage the development of satisfactory school climate scales for future use not only in studies of desegregation, but more generally.

Therefore, the Task Force on Evaluation recommends that NACEEO inform the Assistant Secretary of Education of the lack of such measuring devices and of their importance to the nation's educational program, and request that steps be taken to ensure that this affective domain can be evaluated.

Respectfully submitted by:

Jacquelyne Jackson

Jacquelyne Jackson, Chairperson
NACEEO Task Force on Evaluation

Haruko Morita

Haruko Morita, Member
NACEEO Task Force on Evaluation

Frederick Mosteller

Frederick Mosteller, Member
NACEEO Task Force on Evaluation

CITED REFERENCES

Coulson, John E., et al. The Third Year of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Implementation. System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, California, March, 1977.

U. S. Office of Education/Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation. Executive Summary, Planning/Evaluation Study, National Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act Basic and Pilot Programs. Washington, D. C., June, 1977.

Wellisch, Jean B., et al. An In-Depth Study of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Schools: 1975-1976. System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, California, March, 1977.

FINAL REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON EVALUATION

of the

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Task Force Members:

Jacquelyne J. Jackson, Chairman
Haruko Morita
Frederick Mosteller

MAY, 1978

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS

The National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity recommends:

1. The organization and execution of a new sequence of comprehensively designed and well-controlled field trials in elementary and secondary education to discover which suggestions for improvements emerging from the many evaluations conducted by the Office of Education and other public and private agencies on various educational support programs raise student achievement levels.

2. For each minority group named in Public Law 92-318 (Title VII, as amended), educational assessments which will yield descriptions and analyses of the current achievement patterns of the group and of the effects of the Emergency School Aid Act and of other educational programs upon it and its important subgroups.

FINAL REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON EVALUATION OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

This final report of the Task Force on Evaluation of the National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity (NACEEO) has three major purposes.

The first is the presentation of our two recommendations, appropriately detailed, which were approved and accepted by NACEEO, and which are being submitted in NACEEO's final report for congressional consideration.

The second is the provision of historical background about the Task Force on Evaluation, emphasizing its major activities and concerns since its inception in 1973.

The third is an acknowledgment of individuals and agencies helpful to the Task Force on Evaluation as it discharged its tasks during the years between 1973 and 1978.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATIONS

Consistent with its major overall objective as that of determining if the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) fulfilled successfully its legislative intents, and if ESAA were properly evaluated, the two recommendations of the Task Force on Evaluation deal with the need for cogent evaluation of educational programs and of the effects of those programs upon

each specific minority group and its important subgroups cited in Public Law 92-318 (Title VII, as amended).

RECOMMENDATION ONE

ESAA was intended to reduce the isolation of minority group students and faculty within our nation's public elementary and secondary schools and to meet the special problems incident to desegregation, a major one of which is raising the achievement levels in reading and mathematics of minority students. Most of the ESAA funds available between 1973 and 1978 were allocated to basic and pilot projects undertaken by local educational agencies. In turn, most of those monies were expended on projects designed to enhance student achievement levels in reading and mathematics.

Thus the major evaluation effort undertaken nationally by the System Development Corporation (SDC) of Santa Monica, California, under a sole source contract with the United States Office of Education (OE), was to evaluate the effects of ESAA upon the reading and mathematical achievement levels of students in affected schools.

Given our belief that it is very important for all students to acquire good skills in the basic areas of reading and mathematics, the Task Force on Evaluation has been primarily concerned about the degree to which ESAA has been suc-

cessful in raising minority student achievement levels within those critical areas.

This concern led to additional ones about such factors as the availability of valid and reliable techniques for evaluating the influence of ESAA upon achievement levels and determining causally the interactional effects between ESAA and related variables, such as school climate, teacher competency, and student socioeconomic background.

Further, we were concerned about interactions between the political climates and the ESAA environmental settings. For example, the SDC evaluation design was affected, in some instances, by inadequate lead-time for obtaining pre-test scores, and in other instances by losing some of its control schools when they were funded for programs similar to or the same as the experimental programs funded by ESAA.

Other problems arose in evaluating ESAA effects in reducing the isolation of minority group students and faculty when insufficient data were available from the Office of Civil Rights or when ESAA-funded local educational agencies were already past the initial stages of racial desegregation within their schools.

In any case, our primary concern was that of determining if ESAA worked in raising student achievement levels, and, if it worked, how it worked, and for whom it worked. While primarily interested in evaluation results produced by SDC, we

were also concerned about evaluation results from ESAA grantees and from various evaluation studies conducted by other public or private agencies or individuals.

Our examination of the ESAA evaluation studies covering the first three years of ESAA, using cross-sectional and longitudinal data, produced by SDC, led us to conclude that OE plans to evaluate ESAA output in part by using an experimental design involving treatment and control schools were good. Genuine experiments in education are rare. Rarer still are those of national or even regional scope. But all the hopes of NACEEO and OE cannot be fulfilled by one such study. We were pleased with some of the results.

However, our overall conclusion was that new ground still needed to be broken, and that reanalyses of already collected data would be of relatively little help in aiding us in knowing and understanding how ESAA and similar educational programs worked, and, if they worked, how they worked, and upon whom they worked.

Our examination of various evaluation studies produced by ESAA grantees for basic, pilot, and nonprofit organizations indicated wide variability within those studies. A few were good, but most were of poor quality. Most of the results, the validi-

ty and reliability of which were generally questionable, were self-serving in the sense that they concluded that their program objectives were amply met, or merely apologized for not meeting their objectives by stressing their unwarranted optimism. For instance, some grantees predicted at the outset greater increases in student achievement than actually took place.

In general, our review of evaluation results produced by a sample of ESAA basic, pilot, and nonprofit grantees in each of the ten regions indicated that little information was available to enhance our knowledge and understanding of what really works in raising student achievement level, and particularly so among each of our minority groups.

We were also struck by the fact that the evaluation results produced by ESAA grantees were typically not considered by OE when grant renewal applications were considered and funded. We concluded that more emphasis on good evaluation could be profitable in answering the important questions about what kinds of educational programs are most useful in raising student achievement levels.

Our review of various studies of public school desegregation related to student achievement impressed us by their inconclusiveness of findings, such as those concerning the precise influence of the racial composition of the classroom and

the use of praise by teachers for student performance in similar environmental settings.

More important, the conclusions we reached were reinforced by our study of Nancy St. John's School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children (Wiley Interscience, New York, 1975). This work reviewed a number of evaluation studies, most of which were focused upon student achievement in reading and mathematics in elementary and secondary schools. It indicated clearly the fragmentation and inconclusiveness of many findings revolving around public school desegregation and minority group student achievement levels.

We also reviewed "Desegregation and Black Achievement" by Robert L. Crain and Rita E. Mahard (an unpublished manuscript read before the National Review Panel on School Desegregation in Amelia Island, Florida, October, 1977). It also supported the conclusions we reached when we reviewed St. John's work.

Crain and Mahard, based upon their review of 73 studies, indicated that some gains in cognitive achievement generally accrue from desegregation for black children. While these gains are not uniform, and their amounts are not well-established, the weight of evidence is in the direction of gains. This work also suggests that, even without desegregation, there may be some ways of strengthening black student achieve-

ment, and, we would suppose, that of other minority groups.

This is not to overlook the very strong suggestion within this work that the greatest gains in improving cognitive functioning may well occur when desegregation occurs within the very early years of schooling, beginning with the first grade, if not, perhaps, sooner among pre-schoolers.

We know that much more information about the effects of such variables as classroom racial composition, teacher competency, pedagogical methods, and school climate is needed to determine the educational factors most conducive to higher achievement by both majority and minority students. Variables which have been found to be associated with increased achievement levels need now to be subjected to more rigorous investigation emphasizing the establishment of causal patterns.

Causal investigations can be very helpful to policymakers, who, of course, are critically aware of the important difference between scientific and engineering questions related to desegregation and to efforts to raise the achievement levels of low-achieving students. Policymakers are concerned with the overall effects of programmatic increases on achievement levels of those students.

Therefore,

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY RECOMMENDS THE ORGANIZATION AND EXECUTION OF A NEW SEQUENCE OF COMPREHENSIVELY DESIGNED AND WELL-CONTROLLED FIELD

TRIALS IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION TO DISCOVER WHICH SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS EMERGING FROM THE MANY EVALUATIONS CONDUCTED BY THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION AND OTHER PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AGENCIES ON VARIOUS EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT PROGRAMS RAISE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS.

RECOMMENDATION TWO

Since our inception, we have been concerned about the paucity or absence of information about the achievement levels of specific minority groups named in Public Law 92-318 (Title VII, as amended), and about such effects upon relevant subgroups within each of those minority groups. Relevant subgroups include sex, age, nationality, length of residence within the United States, and other important grouping variables.

In 1973, for example, we recommended the collection and analysis of data relative to each group, and to each of its important subgroups, so as to improve our knowledge and understanding of its achievement patterns. The need for much better information about these groups, such as blacks, various American Indian tribes, Chinese, Filipinos, Hawaiians, Koreans, Japanese, Cubans, Mexican-Americans, and Puerto Ricans, still exists. This need arises from the considerable heterogeneity found between and within each of the specified groups, including the differential impact of independent variables, such as the ESAA program, upon them.

Each relevant group should be regarded as a population. Adequate samples for generating valid and reliable statistical inferences need to be obtained for each population. The resulting information will help us to understand not only the communalities between or within these groups, but also their differences.

We emphasize that the information gained from the kinds of studies we have suggested could be extremely helpful in forming educational policies and programs likely to raise the achievement levels of specific subgroups within each minority group.

Therefore,

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY RECOMMENDS, FOR EACH MINORITY GROUP NAMED IN PUBLIC LAW 92-318 (TITLE VII, AS AMENDED), EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENTS WHICH WILL YIELD DESCRIPTIONS AND ANALYSES OF THE CURRENT ACHIVEMENT PATTERNS OF THE GROUP AND OF THE EFFECTS OF ESAA AND OF OTHER EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS UPON IT AND ITS IMPORTANT SUBGROUPS.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Task Force on Evaluation, originally the Evaluation Committee, of the National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity, was formed in February, 1973, with its continuing members being Drs. Jacquelyne Jackson (Associate Professor of Medical Sociology, Duke University), Haruko Mori-

ta (Principal, Hillside Elementary School, Los Angeles, California), and Frederick Mosteller (Chairman, Department of Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Harvard University).

The three major tasks of the Task Force on Evaluation during its first few months were those of (1) acquiring sufficient knowledge and understanding of the contractual agreement between OE and SDC for evaluating ESAA; (2) developing some recommendations which might aid that evaluation; and (3) critiquing the major evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Program, ESAA's predecessor, with particular emphasis upon the validity and reliability of its finding about the significant achievement gains by Southern black, tenth-grade males. NACEEO requested a reevaluation of the ESAP data. OE consented. Rand Corporation performed the reanalysis, generating several new hypotheses. Though unexplained, it left standing the black male gain.

Since then, the Task Force on Evaluation has been primarily concerned with reviewing various evaluation reports submitted by SDC, by a sample of basic, pilot, and nonprofit ESAA grantees, and those available from public and private resources, such as the aforementioned St. John study. The Task Force on Evaluation has also been concerned with development, wherever appropriate, of new recommendations or, as in the case of an earlier recommendation about oversampling minority groups, modifying old ones in light of new insights.

In addition, the Task Force on Evaluation has requested evaluation studies of the nonprofit organizations, and has been gratified by appropriate OE action taken in that direction. It has also contributed to draft interim reports of NACEEO and conducted various site visits and grantee discussions.

One of our continuing concerns remains that of identifying the extent to which ESAA has been successful in reducing minority group isolation of faculty and students through increased physically desegregated facilities.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Task Force on Evaluation acknowledges with gratitude and appreciation the aid it received from Dr. John Coulson, principal investigator, SDC; Drs. Herman Goldberg, John Evans, and Robert York, and Elton Ridge, of OE, and from Dr. Michael Wargo, formerly of OE; Dr. William Cleveland, Statistician, Duke University; Dr. Dale Parnell, formerly NACEEO chairman; William G. Fuller and Agnes Mussmacher, the first Executive Director and Administrative Assistant respectively of NACEEO; and Leo Lorenzo and Rosie Maynez, successors respectively to Fuller and Mussmacher.

REPORT OF THE LEGISLATIVE & ADMINISTRATIVE TASK FORCE

of the

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Task Force Members:

Edward P. Meyers, Chairman
Lawrence F. Davenport
Jackson F. Lee
Sally A. Stempinski

MAY, 1978

LEGISLATIVE & ADMINISTRATIVE TASK FORCE

This Task Force is an outgrowth of combining the functions of two former NACEEO standing Committees (Legislative and Legal).

The charge given to this Task Force is one of providing the Council with the analysis of all amendments to the law and regulations, and performing oversight functions on all phases of USOE administration of the ESAA program, with the exception of the national evaluation component.

In fulfilling its mandate, the Task force has utilized a variety of approaches, including program site reviews, public hearings, and independent consultative expertise.

Historically, this Task Force and its predecessors were eager to discover the features of the program that worked reasonably well, those components that needed revision or deletion, and the overall effectiveness of leadership and administrative guidance provided to the ESAA consumer. From the very early stages, recommendations have been made pointing out weaknesses in the administration of the program and suggesting changes in the law and regulations that could better address the issues, purposes, and goals of equality of educational opportunity.

The overall response by USOE administrators of the ESAA program to the programmatic and legislative recommendations is disappointing. Aggressive cooperation by USOE has not been the hallmark. There have been repeated solicitations from the group for more active, full, and early involvement in all aspects of ESAA program development. Toleration and sporadic assistance have been the modus operandi rather than a true partnership.

This Task Force takes pride in pointing out the fact that two major investigations,[1] plus the Administration's own ESAA legislative proposals in 1978 clearly

---

[1]Stanford Research Institute Study, "The State Role in School Desegregation," July 1977, and the GAO report, "Better Criteria Needed For Awarding Grants For School Deseqregation."

support viewpoints expounded by NACEEO on legislative and administrative matters over the past three years.

The majority of new recommendations which this Task Force is submitting for adoption are the results of an extensive fact-finding review of ESAA proposal processing which was conducted during FY-1977. The Task Force has deleted many of its suggestions due to the recent reorganization of ESAA operations and change of program administration from regional offices to headquarters. Those maintained are the ones we feel are appropriate regardless of the actual locus of functional operation.

The Legislative & Administrative Task Force hereby submits for adoption by the full Council the following recommendations:

A) Administrative:

1) The Division of Equal Educational Opportunity should develop a uniform method to evaluate the quality of technical assistance being provided by federal ESAA program officers.

2) The Division of Equal Educational Opportunity should institute a policy requiring rotation of ESAA program officer assignments at least every two to three years.

3) The Division of Equal Educational Opportunity should develop standard criteria and definitions for the categories of individuals who comprise the nonfederal proposal review panels.

4) The Division of Equal Educational Opportunity should establish uniform criteria for determining the quality and degree of school desegregation experience needed to qualify an individual as an ESAA panelist.

5) The Division of Equal Educational Opportunity should require the nonfederal ESAA review panelists to sign a statement to the effect they understand the desegregation or racial reduction plan that underlies an applicant's request for ESAA funds.

6) That the Division of Equal Educational Opportunity require nonfederal panelists to sign a statement that they understand the ESAA regulations.

7) The Division of Equal Educational Opportunity should clarify its policy with respect to the minimum data required for an application to be considered eligible for review and scoring so that it is clear the intent of Section 710 pertaining to the establishment and involvement of citizen advisory groups must be met prior to any action on the proposal.

8) The Division of Equal Educational Opportunity should establish a policy requiring yearly changes in the scheduling order for proposal review to insure that the applicants whose proposals are read on a given day one year are not scheduled to be read in the same sequence the following year, nor should they be reviewed by the same panelist from one year to the next.

9) The Division of Equal Educational Opportunity should utilize a more extensive prepanel administrative review of the proposal budget prior to submitting the proposal to the nonfederal panelist, thereby avoiding the problem of having the panelist influenced by the inclusion of "unallowable" cost items and activities <u>not directly</u> related to nor necessary to the support of the development or implementation of an eligible plan as defined in Section 706 of the Act.

10) A comprehensive report should be developed concerning the amount of unexpended ESAA funds returned by ESAA grantees, and the amount of unobligated funds returned by USOE each year since 1973.

11) A data retrieval system capable of providing a wide-range of information on ESAA program operations should be developed.

12) The factors used to determine "need" for ESAA funds utilized by USOE in ascertaining the Quantitative Score should be changed so as to award points only with regard to the number of school children directly affected by the eligibility plan rather than awarding points for the number of students and the number of minority students throughout the entire district.

13) The factors used to determine the qualitative score should be revised whereby the automatic awarding of points for established advisory councils should be discontinued in favor of award of points only if the applicant provides sufficient data showing the involvement of advisory councils and other interested community people in the development of the program.

14) The policy allowing ESAA Pilot funds to be expended in minority isolated schools not affected by the eligibility plan under Section 706 should be discontinued.

15) The Assistant Secretary should, under the discretionary authority provided under Section 708, set aside sufficient funds to make awards to applicants seeking relief under an Office of Civil Rights approved Comprehensive Educational Plan. Only applicants of majority/minority school districts unable to meet the criteria specified in Section 706 would be eligible provided they submit an approveable plan to OCR and their proposal, addressed to one of the Act's stated purposes is of sufficient merit to warrant consideration.

16) Specific criteria that provides for a consistent, uniform interpretation of Section 707 (a)(1-15) should be developed and made public. The public requires guidance in interpreting the scope of such terms as the following:

707(a)(1) - schools "affected" by plan

707(a)(2) - "special training" in "desegregation problems"

707(a)(3) - "teacher aide"

707(a)(4) - "enhance"

707(a)(5) - "other personnel services"

707(a)(7) - "education programs" using "shared" facilities for career education and "other specialized activities"

707(a)(8) - "innovative" "other children"

707(a)(10)- "administative/auxiliary" services

The Task Force members are concerned that ESAA funds may be supporting too wide a range of activities not really related to the purposes of ESAA, nor absolutely necessary for the implementation of a plan under Section 706.

17) The general public should be informed as early as possible of the specific criteria utilized by the Assistant Secretary in selecting the ESAA discretionary projects in areas such as Arts, Student Special Concerns, and Career, as well as any new areas she may decide upon.

18) The general public should be informed of the specific criteria for judging "exceptionality and substantial progress" under part 185.62 (L) of the regulations.

19) Guidelines should be developed and disseminated to school districts, nonprofit organizations, and especially to panelists and citizen advisory committees to help them

in determining activities that meet Section 708(3) of the law which mandates all programs that are funded under Section 708 be designed to complement any program or project carried out by local educational agencies under 706.

The present regulations and scoring criteria utilized in evaluating nonprofit group proposals under ESAA do not give sufficient weight to this Congressional requirement.

20) The Assistant Secretary should utilize her discretionary authority to establish one or two ESAA depositories which would serve as centers for the collection, evaluation, and dissemination of information and materials concerning equal educational opportunity. These centers would store information pertaining to school desegregation and reducing racial isolation in addition to that produced under ESAA and CRA IV funding. The depositories would also act as overall coordinators between General Assistance Centers funded under CRA IV and NIE funded ERIC clearinghouses, both of which deal with parallel issues.

CONGRESSIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1) Review of funding patterns during the life span of ESAA indicates the need to either revise or repeal Section 706(C)(iii) prevention projects, and 706(E) integrated schools project. The criteria for both of these programs does not appear to contribute to nor motivate districts in the reduction of minority group isolation or in overcoming the disadvantages of minority group isolation.

2) The set-aside requirement under Section 704(b) pertaining to Sections 708(c) and Section 711 should be repealed. The nonEnglish dominant issue and quality of educational opportunity are addressed under Title VII ESEA. There also exists a separate funding for Educational Television which should address as one of its priorities minority group children concerns. Keeping funds set aside for these specific purposes under ESAA does not seem warranted as an emergency need to desegregating school districts at this point in time.

3) Congress should direct GAO to expand its initial study of the ESAA program.

GPO 933 538